

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,091	01/24/2001	John Hsuan	13078.16US01 6403	
23552	7590 09/06/2006		EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC			VIG, NARESH	
P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	
		DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/769,091	HSUAN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Naresh Vig	3629			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Ju	<u>ıne 2006</u> .				
•	•—				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1 - 7, 11, 14 and 26 - 30 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> </ul>					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 – 7, 11, 14 and 26 – 30</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
	diffiler. Note the attached Office	Action of former 10-132.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
200 the stability detailed office determined a list	o. and contained copies flot receive	<del></del>			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3629

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This is reference to response received 26 June 2006. There are 14 claims, claims 1-7, 11, 14 and 26-30 pending for examination.

## Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that cited reference Eisenhart fails to disclose or suggest implementing matches and business plans for the certified resource provider based on similarities to business models of the other certified resource providers.

However, Eisenhart this limitation. See Fig. 7 and disclosure associated with Fig. 7. Also, applicant is arguing Field of use as their invention.

In response to applicant's argument that cited reference Eisenhart fails to disclose or suggest implementing. Applicant merely performs the step of matching, but, does not use the results of the matching step.

However, Eisenhart teaches concept of recommending other members [0014].

In response to applicant's argument that cited reference Eisenhart does not disclose providing business plans to the user and, moreover, providing business plans based on similarities to the business models of the other providers.

Applicant is arguing a limitation not positively claimed by the applicant.

In response to applicant's argument that cited reference Eisenhart does not disclose or suggest examining multiple items of the resource provider to certify the resource provider as being able to provide at least one selected from the group consisting of capital, land, building rental, management groups, rules and regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans.

However, applicant is arguing a limitation that the service provider has to provide more than one items, and, this limitation is not positively claimed by the applicant.

In response to applicant's argument that at no point does cited reference

Eisenhart disclose how such submissions would enable the system to certify the ability

of a resource provider to provide a particular resource.

However, Eisenhart teaches to verify qualifications of potential member (i.e. certifies).

Art Unit: 3629

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 7, 11, 14 and 26 – 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenhart US Publication 2001/0047276.

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Eisenhart teaches system and method for efficiently matching resources required to establish businesses and business facilities through the Internet. Eisenhart teaches:

providing an electronic hub system configured to communicate with at least aone resource provider [Fig. 3 and disclosure associated with Fig. 3];

communicatively coupling said resource provider with said electronic hub system [Fig. 1 and disclosure associated with Fig. 1];

examining a plurality of items of said resource provider to certify said resource provider as being able to provide at least one of capital, land building rental, management groups, rules and regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans;

Eisenhart does not explicitly teach resource provider as being able to provide from a group consisting of capital, land building rental, management groups, rules and regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans (i.e. limiting system and method to

Art Unit: 3629

be used within the specific group of items). However, Eisenhart teaches resource provider as being able to provide from a group consisting of atleast capital;

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eisenhart and expand the group by adding additional elements in the groups to make the system and method available to plurality of types of suppliers and requesters.

Eisenhart with the expansion of group teaches:

storing a record of said certified resource provider in said electronic hub system [Fig. 6, 7A and disclosure associated with Fig. 6, 7A]; and

matching said resource provider according to said record of said resource provider with other certified resource providers having a record saved in said electronic hub system [Fig. 7B and disclosure associated with Fig. 7B]

collecting and analyzing records of said certified resource providers factory [Fig. 7B and disclosure associated with Fig. 7B]; and

implementing matches and business plans for said certified resource provider based on similarities to business models of the other certified resource providers enable efficient obtainment of resources necessary for establishing a company or a factory [Fig. 7B and disclosure associated with Fig. 7B].

Regarding claim 2 and 27, Eisenhart teaches establishing an electronic contract for said resource provider [0090].

Art Unit: 3629

Regarding claim 3, Eisenhart teaches electronic hub system comprises an electronic hub and a data storage device [Fig. 2,3 and disclosure associated with Fig. 2, 3].

Regarding claim 4, Eisanhart teaches data storage device comprises a plurality of databases built therein (known to one of ordinary skill in the art that DBMS like Oracle, Sybase etc. allows users to create plurality of databases on the storage device upon which the DBMS is installed) [Fig. 6 and disclosure associated with Fig. 6].

Regarding claims 5 and 28, as responded to earlier in response to claim 4, Eisenhart teaches capability for database to comprise:

a resource database and said record of said resource provider stored therein;
a certified resource database having said record of said certified resource provider
with said items;

a business model database having a plurality of business models of enterprises; and

a plan database having at least a business plan combining said record of said resource provider with said business models of enterprises.

Regarding claims 6 and 29, Eisenhart teaches:

defining a priority of said business plans according to similarities to said business models of said certified resource providers [0061];

Art Unit: 3629

saving said business plans in said electronic hub system [Fig. 7A and disclosure associated with Fig. 7A];

sending said business plans to said resource providers certified [Fig. 7D and disclosure associated with Fig. 7D]; and

displaying said business plans [claim 6].

Regarding claim 7, as responded to earlier, Eisenhart teaches capability wherein said resource provider comprises a capital provider.

Regarding claim 11, Eisenhart teaches capability wherein items comprises an official document related to said resource provider [0054].

Regarding claims14 and 30, Eisenhart teaches:

logging in said electronic hub system [0012];

selecting a class for said resource provider [Registration Form, Fig. 7A and disclosure associated with Fig. 7A];

selecting a scope for said resource provider [Registration Form, Fig. 7A and disclosure associated with Fig. 7A];

assigning an identification number to said resource provider [Fig. 7A and disclosure associated with Fig. 7A]; and

saving said record of said resource provider in said electronic hub system [Fig. 7A and disclosure associated with Fig. 7A].

Art Unit: 3629

#### Conclusion

Applicant is required under 37 CRF '1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naresh Vig whose telephone number is (571) 272-6810. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 6:00 (Wednesday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/769,091 Page 9

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Harosh Vig Naresh Vig Examiner

September 2, 2006 Art Unit 3629